



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

platz, dessen bleibende Realität in grellem Gegensatz zu der einnächtlichen Erscheinung der Geisterwelt der Klassischen Walpurgisnacht stände. Wenn er mit dieser vorübergehenden Geisternacht die bleibende Unterwelt unmittelbar in der räumlichen Erscheinung verbunden hätte, so hätte er in die Geisternacht eine Daseinsart von ganz anderem Wesen eingeschaltet, eine ewige Welt mitten in eine vorübergehende gestellt: diese von mir nachgewiesene Einschaltung einer Daseinsart in eine andere, mit der sie nicht stimmt, und die eingetreten wäre, wenn Goethe die Szene Manto vor Proserpina ausgeführt hätte, fasst nun Gerber in unbegreiflich kurzsichtiger Weise so, als ob damit ausgedrückt werden sollte, ich meinte, Goethe habe die beabsichtigte Szene in der Unterwelt unmittelbar an die Szene des Zwiegespräches der Manto und des Faust anfügen wollen! Er merkt gar nicht, dass diese Einschaltung eingetreten wäre, mochte Goethe die Szene hinstellen, wo er hinwollte, also auch wenn er sie an das Ende des zweiten oder den Anfang des dritten Aktes gestellt hätte: dass er sie aber irgendwo anders hätte hinstellen wollen, ist *nirgends* behauptet worden. So fällt denn auch seine schöne Deklamation von der Weimarer Ausgabe "which was always at his [Valentin's] elbow and of which he is himself co-editor," sowie die glänzende Aufzählung der "eight different places," die alle beweisen sollen, dass "Goethe never dreamed of inserting it, but always intended to put it at the close." Wer träumt, ist einzig und allein Gerber, der nicht einsieht, dass die Einführung einer dauernden Wirklichkeit in eine vorübergehende Wirklichkeit unter allen Umständen eine Einschaltung eines fremden Elementes ist, mag sie nun am Anfang, in der Mitte, oder am Ende stehen. Wenn nun aber auch der letzte Trumpf hinfällig ist, wenn der Knalleffekt, den Gerber sehr wirkungsvoll sich für das Ende seiner Ausführungen aufgehoben hat, so jämmerlich verputscht, so wird ja nun auch die Wirkung des gewaltigen Bannes, den er schliesslich von seinem Unfehlbarkeitsstuhle gegen meine Darstellung des dramatischen Aufbaues der Faustdichtung herabschleudert, seinem inneren Werte entsprechen.

Aber hat denn Gerber etwas Besseres an

die Stelle dessen zu setzen, was er so leidenschaftlich vernichten möchte? Er behauptet (1897, S. 78),

"the main purpose of Homunkulus is to embody one of Goethe's long-cherished scientific ideas, the grand idea of evolution."

Ist das der Zweck des Homunculus, so hätte sich Goethe die Sache weit einfacher machen können: wozu der ganze Aufwand einer dramatischen Gestaltung, die innerhalb des Dramas gänzlich zwecklos ist, deren Zweck vielmehr ausserhalb des Dramas läge, und die gänzlich ins Nichts zerfällt, sobald der ausserhalb des Dramas liegende Zweck erfüllt ist? Wenn Goethe "the grand idea of evolution" verkörpern wollte, wozu gerade diese seltsame Gestaltung, wozu gerade in seinem "Faust?" Entweder diese Verkörperung hat innerhalb des Dramas einen Sinn,—dann ist dieser Sinn im Zusammenhang mit dem ganzen Drama zu suchen und nachzuweisen, und das versuche ich; oder sie hat innerhalb des Dramas keinen Sinn: sie soll nur eine lang gehegte und gepflegte wissenschaftliche Idee verkörpern—warum gerade so, gerade hier, ist gleichgiltig: sie taucht auf nach Willkür, sie taucht unter nach Willkür—das will Gerber feststellen. Ob es ihm gelingt, Glauben dafür zu finden? Einstweilen wird noch einiger Zweifel gestattet sein.

VEIT VALENTIN.

Frankfurt am Main.

ABROAD.

IN reading Icelandic sagas, one cannot fail to be struck by the strangely familiar and frequent expression *fara á brot, á braut*, etc. meaning 'to go abroad, away,' etc. The English dictionaries, however, Skeat's *Etym. Dict.*, *The Century*, *Murray's*, *The Standard*, *Webster's*, *Worcester's*, and the rest, without exception, given under *abroad* the simple, mechanical derivation from 'a' + 'broad.'

On further search I find that T. L. K. Oliphant once thought of *á brot* as the proper derivation; for in the 1878 edition of his *Old and Middle English*, p. 424, where he discusses the language of M. E. works Robert of Gloucester's *Lives of the Saints* (copied ca. 1250 by Northumbrian monks) and of the *Cursor Mundi*, in

both of which numerous Scandinavian words appear for the first time, he recognizes an *a brod* meaning *latē*, and an *a brod* meaning *foris* which, he says, comes from the Scandinavian; but in the ed. of 1891, p. 367, he withdraws the statement entirely, only remarking in its place that we have here to do with a strange, new kind of adverb, formed by compounding a preposition with an adjective, a thing unknown before.

The history of the occurrence of the word seems to me to prove rather conclusively that the second component was not an adjective but the Icelandic noun *brot*, *brott*, *braut*, from *brjota* = 'to break through,' 'to make a road'; hence *á brott* = 'on a journey,' 'abroad,' precisely like our 'away.'

Following Murray's chronology, we find the first occurrence of the word about 1260; cf. *E. E. Poems* 6, '*Al þat þou wæn here wiþ pine, a bro[d] þin eir sal wast it al.*' Other representative instances are, Robt. of Gloucester (ca. 1297) l. 542, '*That win orn a brod so;*' *Apol. for Lollards* (1400) l. 73, '*He þat gedreþ not wiþ me, he skateriþ a brod;*' Langland, *P. Pl.* (1377) B. ii, 176, '*abrōde iu visitynge*'; *Syr Generides* (1430), l. 4487, '*With his armes spred on brode*;' and Sturkey's *England* (1538), 148, '*For I wot not whether I may speke this a-brode.*' That is to say, that in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries the regular form was '*a brod*;' in the fourteenth, instances of '*a-brood*' come up; in the fifteenth, '*on brode*' makes its appearance; and in the fifteenth and sixteenth, '*a-brode*' gradually merges into the present form.

Here two important points are to be noted: 1. the form of the preposition, and 2. that of the so-called adjective at different times. Compare any of the other words of similar make-up like 'aside,' 'absent,' 'asleep.' For instance, 'asleep,' in the twelfth century, was '*an slep*;' in the thirteenth, '*on slepe*;' from the thirteenth to the fifteenth, '*on slepe*;' then only came the forms '*asslepe*,' '*asleepe*,' and '*asleep*.' But 'abroad' had the form '*a brod*' from the very beginning, and was not assimilated to the forms with '*on*' until late, when '*on*' was about to pass into the present 'a'.

In the second place, the regular spelling of the adjective 'broad' was '*brad*' throughout the period of '*a brod*,' with but few scattered

occurrences of '*brod*,' most of which are late; while '*on brade*' is mentioned but once, which is also late. There exist individual cases of confusion with other words, as with '*abrood*,' cf. *Owl and Nightingale* 518 (a. 1250), '*So sone so thu sittest abrode, thu for-lost al thine wise*'; and with 'aboard,' cf. *Guylforde Pylgr.* 62 (1506), '*We laye amos tharde abrode the grete uggly rokkes*;' but these have no bearing on the question of the origin of the word.

A.S. dennode.

OF all the unexplained words in A.S. literature, this one is especially interesting on account of the large variety of conjectures which have been offered as to its meaning.

As far as is known, *dennode* occurs but once; namely, in line 12 of the *Battle of Brunanburh*. Of the seven MSS. of the *A. S. Chronicles* only four contain this poem, and these present the following variations of the word: Cott. Tib. A. VI. and B. I. *dennade*, Cott. Tib. B. IV. *dennode*, and the Cantab. (Parker) Text *dænnede*. To these is to be added *dynede*, Wheloc's reading of the destroyed MS. Otho B. XI. (a. 1633).

As to interpretation, Grein, Wülker, Bosworth-Toller, Bright, and Davis follow Ettmüller, who translated the word by *lubricum fieri* = 'to become slippery,' without attempting to give any sources or grounds for that idea; Ingram, Earle and Körner (who translates *klatschte*, *ertönte*, and in a note *Stud. des Ags.*, p. 223, *fürbte sich dunkel*) adopt Gibson's rendering of *feld dennode* = *campi resonarunt* = 'the field resounded with din,' connecting *dennode* with *dynian*, 'to resound;' Thorpe and Freeman translate 'the field streamed,' connecting the word with O.N. *dun-di* from *dynia*; Rieger proposes the reading *dænnede*, and translates *wurde gedüngt*; Hunt (quoted by Gibson, *Chron. Sax.*) suggests *sudarunt*; and Zupitza, Kluge, and Sweet leave the word untranslated in their vocabularies.

Zupitza, in a note, ventures to suggest *verstecken* = 'to hide,' from M.E. *dennien* = Mod. Eng. 'to den' = 'to give shelter.'

Ettmüller's rendering of the passage *feld dennode secga swate*, 'the field became slippery

with the blood of heroes', makes good sense, but does not seem to be supported by any philological evidence. The renderings 'resounded,' *klatschte* (suggesting the noise of wading in blood, or the splashing of blood on the ground), 'streamed,' *wurde gedüngt*, and *wurde versteckt*, besides having only very far-fetched derivations, are in the main either exaggerated or inappropriate in meaning.

A more suitable explanation is suggested by the Gothic *dauns* = *Dunst*, *Geruch*, 'steam,' 'smell.' From this we should regularly expect a weak verb *daunjan* or *daunōn*; neither of these is recorded in Gothic, but the Icel. derives a verb in the *-nan* class from *daunn*. Goth. *daunjan* would be in Anglo-Saxon (*dēanian*) *dienan* (*dēnan*, cf. Sievers, *AgS. Gram.* §§. 97, 99), *dýnan*, pret. *dien(e)de*, *dēn(e)de*, *dýn(e)de*; Goth. *daunōn* would be A.S. *dēanian* pret. *dēanode*.

Now taking into consideration the striking appropriateness of such an expression in the context, it seems very probable that the passage under discussion originally read *feld dýn(e)de*, or *deanode*, *secga swate*, 'the field reeked with the blood of heroes.' Wheloc's reading supports the first of the two forms here proposed; the second more readily explains the variants *dennode*, *dennade*, since *ea* could easily be misread *en*.

JOHN HEISS.

Purdue University.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

Immermann's Merlin, by KURT JAHN. Palæstra, ed. Alois Brandl and Erich Schmidt. Part III. Berlin: Mayer and Müller, 1899.

KURT JAHN has undertaken to apply the method of psychological criticism to Karl Immermann's drama *Merlin*. He has brought out some facts of interest to the student of Immermann's works and personality, but in treating these facts as an all-sufficient cause for the creation of the drama *Merlin*, he reaches conclusions that can by no means stand as the self-evident truths as which they are proclaimed. The most that can be said in their favor is, that they contain at times an element of possibility, but hardly of probability, much less of certainty.

Psychological criticism, after all has been said in its favor, is at best suggestive as to deductions, but it can never itself draw conclusions as to absolute truths. For there are always elements of the creative faculty that escape the scalpel and microscope, and the bearing of these incommensurate factors upon a given work of art can never be wholly disregarded in forming a critical judgment of the work. Kurt Jahn, however, as it seems to us, does so disregard them in his treatment of *Merlin*, and this disregard has led him into error. There are striking instances of false deductions in his treatise. It will suffice to point out two of these.

1. Kurt Jahn reaches the startling conclusion (pp. 44, 66) that in the figure of Klingsohr, Immerman caricatured the *weltanschauung* and the character of Goethe.

The fact that Klingsohr is on the whole a creation of Immermann's own, evidently tempted Kurt Jahn to search for the psychological causes of this creation. Unhappily he finds in one of Immermann's letters to Tieck (Nov. 28, 1837) the following statement:

"Ich hätte Goethe sehr gern gesehen, mich dünkt, dass sein Wesen grade in diesem sonderbaren Augenblick eine eigenthümliche Anschauung gewähren musste. Auf der anderen Seite tröstet mich wieder die Betrachtung, dass ein persönliches Zusammentreffen mir wahrscheinlich denn doch die Figur meines Klingsohr verrückt haben würde."

This statement, Kurt Jahn thinks, must associate Goethe and Klingsohr, particularly as he finds in Immermann's letters a few other scattered remarks and innuendoes that are apparently directed against Goethe.

The following facts, however, bearing on Immermann's relation to Goethe, could not be disputed by Kurt Jahn. Up to the year 1830, approximately, Immermann had been a stanch admirer of Goethe, freely acknowledging his greatness, though not closing his eyes to his errors and faults. During his literary career he had been more or less under the paramount influence of the writer of *Faust* and *Wilhelm Meister*. He had unmercifully ridiculed the petty attacks upon the latter work. Furthermore, at Goethe's death, Immerman arranged and directed the impressive ceremony at the theatre at Düsseldorf, and